Vol. I.

Boston, Mass., Saturday, December 10, 1881.

No. 10.

HONORING A GREAT LAW-BREAKER.

On the evening of Friday, December 2, the twenty-second anniversary of the execution of old John Brown of Osawatomie at Harper's Ferry, a festival in honor of the hero's memory was held at New York in the theatre of Tymn Hall. A large audience, made up in part of ladies, was present, including also not a few colored people. The hall was prettily and appropriately decorated, and the meeting was held under the auspices of workingmen, and, as was eminently fit, the tributes of the evening to the martyr: oppressed black labor came from the lips of men now among the foremost in championing oppressed white labor,—the speakers being Hugh Mcleod, Victor Dray, and John Sinton. The latter made the principal speech of the evening, and nothing could be more appropriate to Liberty's columns than the following extract from the New York 'Sow's' report:

"It was hard to tell in what way we should properly estimate the depth and the scope of the influence of this man John Brown upon our country's history. We know that after ages of toil and suffering for American freedom, he was the first man to enter its stronghold andimos with its sword, and we know how quickly the sword that was struck from his hand brought destruction. We know how he loved and strove in safety before he delivered its blow; we know how it rested on his shoulder. We know how the South was startled by Harper's Ferry, and how the North. It was the challenge to the North, the first shot in the war. It was a new policy that John Brown brought into play against American slavery,—the policy of meeting it upon its own terms and in its own field, confronting with force a system based upon force, and establishing human rights by the weapons that upheld public wrongs. In place of the old way of acquiescing in slavery, or combating with it or arguing against it, or resisting it in safety, or laying it down, he declared his determination to make the nation feel and face the issue, and to make the momentous declaration: 'I accept your demand for a negro slave.' In this way John Brown's life and work is justified and of itself, inasmuch as he was the first man to do this, the first man to strike against slavery by driving the issue to a battle which men must and must win. It is nature's way to judge men and nations, and it is a mistake to think that the judgment will be wrong. If I were to judge men and nations I would judge John Brown. "

The Free Religious Index has dropped the adjectives from its name, and wishes henceforth to be known, as of old, simply as the Index. Whether the discarded title implied too much freedom to suit the old management, or too much religion to suit the new, or whether both old and new have become suddenly impressed by the profundity of a remark said to have been made by a near relative of the original manager, Mr. Abbot,—namely, that she did not like the term, "free religion," because it reminded her of "free love,"—we are not informed. But, whatever the motives that inspired it, the change is a good one. A combination of circumstances that makes it expedient for a newspaper to abandon its original name is very impressive. Whether the index, for instance, is anything but a "free religious index" is very questionable. Certainly no such circumstances ever occurred in the history of the Index. The old title is unquestionably simpler, stronger, broader, and, in its present lettering, typographically更适合 than the one recently in use. Its readaptation, therefore, is to be commended. Moreover, the paper itself is now much better "made up" than ever before. The new editor, Mr. Underwood, has restructured its anatomy to advantage. If, in addition, he will infuse some blood into its colorless veins, it will become a readable and valuable journal.

"For always in thine eyes, 0 S Prototype! Shines that which whereabouts the world is saved; And though they slay us, we will triumph in thee."

John Hay.

On Picket Duty.

Without unrestricted competition there can be no true cooperation.

The Boston "Investigator" offers itself to trial subscribers for one month for twenty-five cents. The paper has a glorious record, and all Liberals should unite in rewarding its valiant struggle against superstition by stock support in its honor able and still vigorous old age.

Herbert Spencer, though he knows nothing of Proudhon's ideas and made a complete fool of himself on the only occasion when he ever undertook to criticise them, is as much of an anarchist, if he only knew it, as was Proudhon himself. For his theory of social evolution from militancy to industrialism means the eventual abolition of the State. Mr. Spencer is a philosopher who busies himself more with the past than the future, but the lesson of his teaching and the applications of his theories, though less emphatic on that account, are just as clear to thinking people.

At the recent celebration of John Bright's seventieth birthday, at the hands of the occasion, responding to the tributes of the admirable laboring population, briefly reviewed the progress made in England during his career. In the course of a glorious.ion of free trade he said, jubilantly: "So far as selling to all the world, you are perfectly free with your labor as we are perfectly free with our capital."

What a sorrowful satire upon the present system of industry and commerce that a prominent representative of a class which does not own capital and therefore produces nothing that capital should be able to stand before an audience made up from the class which does nearly all the labor and therefore produces nearly all the capital, and talk to them, unburdened of "your labor" and "our capital!"
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" For... one who enjoys the use of his reason and his freedom... is not merely blinded by passion, nor blinded or driven by oppression, nor deceived by erroneous opinions."—FROEBER.

Guillette's "Malice." When one man kills another, he is no murderer unless he kills him from some motive, which the law calls "malice." And this malice must be such as a sane man can entertain, and such as is naturally sufficient to induce a sane man to commit a murder. The "malice" upon which jurymen are to base their verdicts, when the insane man is not such "malice" as requires to convert a homicide into a murder.

Now, what is that "malice"—such malice as could reasonably be expected to induce a sane man to commit a murder at Garfield's? Does it consist in the conviction of any insane man that he is such "malice" as requires to convert a homicide into a murder.

But Guillette had no or no occasion to be indicant at Garfield personally, on account of his dispossession. If he was indicant at any body, on this account, he evidently had much more reason to be indicant at Blair's than Garfield; for he evidently understood that Blairine, rather than Garfield, was the one who stood in the way of his success.

But admit that Guillette acted from malice—from such malice as a persistent, disapponted, indignant, and, above all, with a vengeance, a disinterested, and, it may reasonably be expected to induce a sane man to commit murder.

This being the case, who can tell the number of dangerous persons there are abroad in the community? What census can enumerate them? It is frightful to think of their number. And they are of all grades, from those who are presumed to the presidcy, down to those who aspire only to the humblest offices in the nation, or the States.

We are far from denying that this class of persons are dangerous. On the contrary, we have no doubt that all officers, the successful ones, as well as the disappointed ones, are dangerous. In fact, we think the successful ones are by far the more dangerous. They kill men by the hundreds of thousands, when it is necessary to maintain their power. But we are now considering only the cases of the disappointed ones.

And here an important inquiry forces itself upon us, viz.: If all persons, indicated, disappointed, and disfavored officers are to be supposed capable of such legal malice as prompts men to commit murder, what shall we say of Blair, and John Seward, and Grant? They were publicly known to be persistent, disappointed, and indignant aspirants for the presidency, at the last election. And it is unlikely that either of them has recovered, or ever will recover, from either his disappointment, or his indignation. They are, therefore, dangerous persons. Yet they are still at large; and who of us are safe from their malice?

But this is not all. The number of like characters—only of lower grades—is such that, on the principle laid down in Guillette's case, they constitute a great public danger; a danger everywhere present, and that no one can guard against. The only remedy would seem to be, to take the precaution, from the principle that "the public safety is the supreme law." If, therefore, Guillette shall be convicted, we shall expect to see the people rise en masse, and abolish the government, as their only means of saving themselves from the injustice, the intolerable, the humiliating, and, in short, all the consequences of a laws that are such as he, and when the accumulated wealth of the world becomes large enough, no one will pay interest.

But the proposition of the payment of interest to-day, and (if it could be done) to find the man of ability, but lacking means, borrowing the capital he needs, or, in other words, his capital, to work hard, and to destroy savery; but, on the other hand, it would diminish the production and accumulation of capital, of one of the principal incentives to that production. "The use of capital to increase production and add to one's wealth. It is obvious, unless the use of capital added to the productivity of labour, no one would wish to borrow, and no interest could be paid. It should not be forgotten, in considering this question, that, in the last analysis, reducing things to their simplest, individualized form, the possessor of capital has acquired it by a willingness to work harder than the others, and the advantage of earning all he produces that he may have the aid of capital to increase his power of production. For example, two men work both of them use the same tools, but the other saves part of his product; in time the latter has saved enough to enable him to build or buy a tool, by the aid of which he acquires more capital, and so on to the same extent as the other.

We wish, for example, that Horace Greeley were still alive, and capable of testifying. He was himself an able, persistent, disapponted, and indignant officer. Whether he was more or less, he knew the game of rage and profanity. We should like to know whether he ever wished to kill any body, except Seward and Thurlow Weed.

They were Seward, and Chase, and Cass, and Webster, and Calhoun, and Clay, who were persistent, disapponted, and indignant office-seekers; seekers of the presidency. We wish they could be put upon the stand, and required to tell what they knew about officers, high and low; and whether they themselves, in their disappointments, ever wished to kill anybody.

What revelations we might have, if all these public and famous office-seekers could be put upon the stand, and made to tell all the facts that they knew. But it is not necessary to call up these old and famous office-seekers. Let them rest, although they never suffered anybody else to rest. Without their oral testimony, we know enough of the nature of public office-seekers to know that, as such, they are all utterly dangerous, and thoroughly bad. We know that the successful ones will murder mankind by the wholesale, to maintain their power; and we know that the unsuccessful ones, behind the scenes, will murder them get into power. But if, not getting into power, they feel indignant, and now and then kill a man, that is a small matter, compared with what they would have done, if they had been successful in their ambitions.

Whether or not a man be sane or insane, it is time to have done with a system that breeds, in such numbers, these dangerous creatures.}

Apex or Basis? "Apex" says that it is a barrier to pay interest on money. That is another name for the idea that society by which wealth is not universalized is barbarous, since, in our present stage of evolution, those who have no capital of their own are no more in the market, and is to pay interest for the use of the capital.

For it is really capital that is borrowed, and not money, the latter is merely the means of exchange, as money would be worthless if it could not be exchanged for the capital needed. We see already that as the loamable capital of a community increases, the lower classes may be glad to borrow from those who have, and to pay interest for the use of the capital.

But the question is of interest to-day, and (if it could be done) to find this man of ability, but lacking means, borrowing the capital he needs, or, in other words, his capital, to work hard and to destroy savery; but, on the other hand, it would diminish the production and accumulation of capital, since one of the principal incentives to that production is the use of capital to increase production and add to one's wealth. It is obvious, unless the use of capital added to the productivity of labour, no one would wish to borrow, and no interest could be paid. It should not be forgotten, in considering this question, that, in the last analysis, reducing things to their simplest, individualized form, the possessor of capital has acquired it by a willingness to work harder than the others, and the advantage of earning all he produces that he may have the aid of capital to increase his power of production. For example, two men work both of them use the same tools, but the other saves part of his product; in time the latter has saved enough to enable him to build or buy a tool, by the aid of which he acquires more capital, and so on to the same extent as the other.

We wish, for example, that Horace Greeley were still alive, and capable of testifying. He was himself an able, persistent, disapponted, and indignant officer. Whether he was more or less, he knew the game of rage and profanity. We should like to know whether he ever wished to kill any body, except Seward and Thurlow Weed.

The question is asked, and it is a very important one, and, simply as it is at bottom, a complex one as it stands,—what is money? It would simplify this matter very much if all would agree that it is gold, or silver, or merchandise, or money, or paper or representative money, currency, or notes. It is plain that the representative money is that which must be at the bottom of all legal tender money of any country. Coin money derives its real value in exchange, and as a measure for the exchangeable value of other products, from the fact that it can produce, and, although government laws may foolishly try to do by means for more than its cost value, they never succeed in doing so. No government may legal tender in fulfilling natural law, though they may and often do obstruct the operations of Nature's laws to the great detriment of Nature's children. The simplest form of representative money, or currency, is furnished by Joseph Warren's labor note, which was substantially as follows (I quote from memory):

For Y value received, I promise to pay bearer, on demand, one hour's labor, or ten pounds of corn.

JOSEPH WARREN.

MODERN TIMES, July 4, 1882.

So long as it was believed by his neighbors that the maker of such notes always had the coin on hand with which to redeem them, since their labor would always be practicable or desirable, they would pass current in that locality; and, in fact, such "labor notes" did pass to a limited extent, and were quite popular, but to the present day, and showing clearly as it does the principle at the basis of all good currency, it could not be extended so as to satisfy the needs of the great commercial country, or, safely, of a large neighborhood.

But a currency, to be good, must possess precisely the qualities which the labor note possessed. It must be a note of a guaranty, universally recognizable, that the notes actually do represent solid worth with which they will be redeemed on demand, there is some labor, and only one, that government can rightfully or wisely do in the way of intermixture with the currency, the only flow of which is governed by natural laws altogether out of the reach of state or national governments; and that is to issue all the notes used for cur-
rency on such terms that it shall be universally known truly to represent actual, movable capital (not land, which is not propri-
tly in the true sense, and which cannot be carried off by any
one without the consent of the person possessing it). There
should be no monopoly, but any and every person com-
plying with the terms should be furnished with the same.

Of course, no one who had not the regulate capital could procure these notes, and rightly so because notes made by
those who have no capital would be false to the people. And
we are ourselves now in danger of being deco-
rated with "Apex," and "Eclipse," and such other notes as
they may either be known to fall into the hands of the
national legislators, should secure the exclusive privilege of issuing the paper dollars for each specie dollar in their vaults, could they not be issued in so
manner as to make their rate of exchange quite vary with
the rate of interest thereby? Undoubtedly; and yet the amount of capital in the country remains the same as before.

Basis.

The remarks that follow are not intended to denote
"Apex," from answering his opponent in these columns
in his own time and way, but simply to combat, from Liberty's standpoint, such of the positions taken by "Basis" as seem to need refutation.

The first error into which "Basis" is led is his identi-
cification of money with capital. Representative money
is not capital; it is only a title to capital. He who borrows a paper dollar from another simply borrows a title, and not all that to which it is a title. Con-
sequently, whatever expense he incurs for paying back the lender wishes to use; unless, indeed, the lender de-
ieres to purchase capital with his dollar, in which case he
will not lend it, or, if he does, will charge for the sacrifice of his opportunity. — a very different thing from using his money for the advancement of his own
interest or for the advancement of the nation's interest, if he is going to get no pecuniary benefit, but for the borrower's use; that is, not for a burden borne, but for a benefit conferred. Neither does the borrower of the dollar take the person of whom he purchases capital with it anything which
is not capital. Indeed, a person would not hire his capital if the seller is either a manufacturer or a dealer, w
produces or buys his stock for no other purpose than to
sell it. And thence this dollar goes on transferring products for which the holders thereof have no use, until it reaches its issuer and final redemer and is then
cancelled, deprecating, in the course of its journey, no
person of any opportunity, but, on the contrary, serv-
ing the ends of $1 through whose hands it passes.

Hence, borrowing is a title to capital. Very different thing from the possession of capital itself. And the
system of organized credit contemplated by "Apex," as
able and deserving person would borrow even a title to capital. The so-called borrower would sim-
ply change the title of capital from one person to another, recognizably by the world at large, and at no other expense than the mere cost of the alteration. That is
to say, the man, having capital or good credit, who,
under the system advocated by "Apex," should go to a
credit-shy man and ask him for title to capital, would
not be hard to find, and would at any rate be a capital
system of organized credit contemplated by "Apex," as
capable and deserving person would borrow even a
title to capital. The so-called borrower would sim-
ply change the title of capital from one person to another, recognizably by the world at large, and at no other expense than the mere cost of the alteration. That is
to say, the man, having capital or good credit, who,
under the system advocated by "Apex," should go to a
credit-shy man and ask him for title to capital, would
not be hard to find, and would at any rate be a capital
The Redemption of Money.

If we can fully determine what redemption is, we shall accomplish a great work for human progress. A promise to pay, written on paper, is generally considered redeemed when the paper is accepted at its face value. If I make a banknote promising to pay one dollar, and exchange said note with another party for a gold dollar, so far as I am concerned, the note is redeemed; but note is yet outstanding against the bank, it is not redeemed.

If a B note promising to pay one dollar, and B promises to receive it at face value, A receives it at its full face value, that note is fully redeemed. The great difficulty, in connection with the redemption of paper money, consists in this—that the promise to pay implies a promise to pay cash; whereas, by right, it should be considered a promise to pay value equal to gold, or silver, whatever may be taken as the standard of value.

In conclusion—scarcely anybody wants gold, but everybody wants value equal to gold.

If A issues a dollar and buys ten yards of cotton clothe, and a bushel of wheat will buy a gold dollar, can there be any difficulty in exchanging wheat for cotton clothe?

Let us remember that, although an absolute standard of value is impossible, a comparative standard is indispensable. We want something of value by which to compare, count, and exchange all other valuable things. How much fog, mud, and moonshine has been waded through by the would-be teachers of political economy, just because the above truth has been overlooked or denied. People, more often than not, believe the fake and do the wrong.

And even when the true thing has been discovered, they are almost sure to start for it in the wrong direction. This is eminently true.

Let me repeat—everybody wants value. Now, if A, B, and C can exchange their goods on the basis of gold valuation, what is the matter with the rest?

Gold always has a marketable value, which is well known.

Now, let business men make their exchanges on the value of the money, that is, the goods at the money rate. Then they will treat it credit as money, and redeem their promises to pay by receiving them, and thus, by mutually acting together, they can be independent of the money lender. For, by understanding that borrowing money is a good business transaction, it is an exchange of credits. Will the people ever get over the stupid idea that the bond is a bond?

Our paper money at the present time (November, 1881) is all par with gold because the government receives it. If A owes B $1, C holds all the gold he can do. If A has made the promise to pay the gold itself, he must go to C and give him a bonus for the gold. That is the nature of a bond, whether or not B, A, B, or A, B, C, or any other entailed, of affording a convenient terminology to be used in discussing the relation of man to wealth; or, finally, his starting out to explain to us why things that perish almost as fast as they are produced are not capital.

But I will now make it the conclusion of his letter that capital is a stored-up labor, and that "man himself, or the creatures he has civilized, or the land things have civilized are man."

It would be a mistake to think that all work is profitless; work, whether of body or mind, is the source of all wealth and progress. Work is the true source of all wealth.

True civilization: A subject of vital and certain interest to all People, but most immediately to the Man and Woman of the money order. The eighteenth century has been the pilgrim's stage on this great road of progress. The present age is the true one. We have made the discovery that man is a God, and that God is man.

In every age, there has been a struggle between the old and the new. The old is strong, and the new is weak. But the old cannot last forever. The new is sure to overcome the old. The old is always in the way, and the new is always on the way.

The true civilization is the civilization of the future. It is the civilization of the future. It is the civilization of the future.

The Radical Review: Vol. I., handsome bound, with gold and silver edges, 36 months, $10.00. Fine binding, 50 cents. Bifiles by H. H. Boxell, 20 cents per copy. "The Radical Review" is a magazine of radical discussion of the institution of property, the state, the church, the family, and the whole social order. It is the forerunner of a larger and more detailed and more thorough attack of the social systems which exist, and the plans it advo- cates are the only ones which can save society. 36 pages octavo. Price, 50 cents. Single numbers, 15 cents.
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